REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the following comments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant has the following comment with respect to the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, and 10

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 and 10-12 as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,710, to Wiggers (hereinafter "Wiggers") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,202, to Kardach, et al. (hereinafter "Kardach"). One embodiment of Applicant's invention includes a switch that is used to control the parasitic capacitance of a bus. Furthermore, the switch is integrated with a memory circuit. Claim 1 recites: "a switch for decoupling said data bus from said memory circuit when no memory access is being requested by said memory controller so as to reduce parasitic capacitance of said data bus, *wherein the switch is an integrated part of the memory circuit.*" Independent Claims 4 and 10 recite similar limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See* M.P.E.P § 2143.03. Applicant respectfully submits that Wiggers fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation from each of independent Claims 1, 4, and 10. Wiggers describes a memory system for minimizing the capacitive load of a data bus. *See* Abstract. In Wiggers, a memory module (24) is provided that includes memory devices (22) and switches 29. *See* col. 4, lines 43-65. The memory devices (22) may include read only memory (ROM) or random access memory (RAM), and are preferably dynamic random access memory (DRAM). *See* col. 4, lines 50-53.

Applicant respectfully submits that Wiggers fails to teach or suggest a use of a switch that is integrated part of a memory circuit, as is claimed. As can be seen from a visual inspection of Figure 3, the switches (29) are not integrated with the memory circuit (22). Instead, in Wiggers, the memory circuit (22) and the switches (29) are separate components. Applicant respectfully

submits that in one embodiment, Applicant's invention allows for a reduced capacitance memory circuit for legacy computer systems. According to one embodiment of Applicant invention, an improved memory circuit may be provided without providing a new motherboard or a new memory module (24).

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that at least the above-limitation is not taught or suggested by Kardach. In the Office Action, Kardach was relied upon by the Examiner in support of teaching the use of a host processor connected to a memory controller for the purpose of controlling the operation of DRAM. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kardach fails to teach or suggest "a switch for decoupling said data bus from said memory circuit when no memory access is being requested by said memory controller so as to reduce parasitic capacitance of said data bus, *wherein the switch is an integrated part of the memory circuit.*"

Since the cited art fails to teach or suggest at least the above limitation, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 4 and 10 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12

Since Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 11 and 12, each depend on one claims 1, 4 and 10 Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable for the reasons discussed above.

Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. In addition, such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is

Appl. No.   :   10/017,826
Filed   :   December 6, 2001

specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 7/15/2004   By: _____
                                        Eric M. Nelson
                                        Registration No. 43,829
                                        Attorney of Record
                                        Customer No. 20,995
                                        (619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\EMN\EMN-4707.DOC
071504

-4-